SOUTHERN STANDARD.

VOLUME I. COLUMBUS, LOWNDES COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1851. NUMBER 30.

The Southern Standard

IS ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY

CHAPMAN & SMITH,

At three dollars per annum, in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS—First insertion (ten lines or less) $1,00; for each subsequent insertion, 50 cents. The number of insertions must be specified on the face of the copy furnished, or it will be published until forbid and charged as above.

All articles of a personal character will be charged double the above rates—cash in advance when admitted.

Political circulars or public addresses for the benefit of individuals will be charged as advertisements.

On yearly advertisements, a liberal discount will be made. The privilege of yearly advertisers will be limited to their own immediate business; advertisements sent in by them embracing other matter, will be charged for by the square.

☞Letters on business connected with the office must be post paid to insure attention.

COLUMBUS:

Wednesday Morning, Aug. 20, 1851.

Slavery in the Territories.

We promised in our last issue to give the history of the debates on the New Mexico and Utah territorial bills, and to show that every proposition in any form recognizing the right to carry slavery into those territories was voted down; and that every proposition to protect it, fell before an abolition majority in both branches of Congress. We ask our friends to read the record carefully; there are some facts presented that have been industriously suppressed by the defenders of these bills, and we must call to the minds of our readers the positions assumed by Col. Cobb in this canvass. He insists that slaves are admitted up to the 42nd parallel north lat. The reader will remember that there were three or four attempts to obtain the line of 36° 30', and 35° 30', and that they were voted down. How Mr. Cobb proves that slavery can go up to the 42nd parallel is a little strange when it is remembered that the northern men delared that is should not be admitted up to 35° 30'.

We understood Mr. Cobb to say that the line of 36° 30' was proposed to operate by dividing a sovereign State, and hence it failed. It was proposed to divide California before she was *made a State* by Congress, and the argument of Mr. Cobb, if we rightly understood him, is worthless.

But this debate settles one fact, and we hope our readers will note it, and that is that slavery receives no protection whatever, in the territories. Congress refused to permit the territorial legislatures to pass laws to protect slavery in the territories, and yet the people are told that slavery is protected.

We understand that Mr. Cobb insists that the Common Law affords protection—this is an original discovery. But to show the people how far they can rely on the opinions of Mr. Cobb, we invite them to examine the amendment proposed by Toombs of Georgia. The whole will be found below, and we state for the information of Mr. Cobb, that Congress refused to allow the "Common Law as it existed" previous to 1770 "upon the subject of African slavery" to extend to the territory of Utah.

We say then, and we challenge controversy on the point, that slavery cannot exist in those territories—it is as effectually excluded as though Congress had passed the Wilmot proviso, and still the action of Congress is applauded here at the South.

We again ask a careful perusal of what follows.

The Record Presented for the People to Read.

On the 23rd of July, Mr. Davis of Miss., offered the following, as an amendment to the amendment, offered by his colleague, Mr. Foote:

"And that all laws and usages existing in said Territory at the date of its acquisition by the United States, which deny or obstruct the right of any citizen of the United States, to remove to and reside in said Territory, with any species of property legally held in any of the States of this Union, be and are hereby declared to be null and void.

The vote on this amendment was:

Yeas, 22—Davis, Miss., Berrien, Mason &c.

Nays, 33—FOOTE, Seward Hale, Chase, Greene &c.

On the 28th of June, Mr. Yulee of Florida, gave notice that he should introduce the following:

At the end of the 37th section add the following:

"That citizens of the United States emigrating with their slaves into the Territory of Utah, or of New Mexico, shall be protected in their property in such slaves, so long as they continue under territorial governments."

No such proposition is found in either bill—it does not exist.

On the 5th of September, Mr. Toombs of Georgia, introduced the following amendment to the bill providing territorial government for New Mexico:

SEC.— *And be it further enacted*, That no citizen of the United States shall be deprived of his life, liberty, or property, in said Territory except by the judgment of his peers, and the laws of the land; and that the Constitution of the United States, and such statues thereof as may not be locally inapplicable, and the common law as it existed in the British colonies of America until the 4th day of July, 1776, shall be the exclusive laws of said territory upon the subject of African slavery, until altered by the proper authority.

This amendment was divided thus:

"*And be it further enacted*, That no citizen of the United States shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, in said territory, except by the judgment of his peers and the laws of the land."

The question was taken without a division.

The second branch of the proposition then came up thus:

"And that the Constitution of the United States, and such statues thereof as may not be locally inapplicable, and the common law as it existed in the British colonies of America, until the 4th of July, 1776, shall be the exclusive laws of said territory upon the subject of African slavery, until altered by the proper authority."

The above was voted down—Yeas, 64, Nays, 121.

The Utah bill being under discussion, Mr. Seddon, offered the following, to come in immediately after the provision, that the territories when formed into States, should be admitted with or without slavery as the people should declare in their constitution.

"And that prior to the formation of State Constitutions, there shall be no prohibition by reason of any law or usage existing in said Territory, or by the action of the territorial legislature, of the emigration of all citizens of the United States with any kind of property recognized as such in any of the States of the Union."

After reading the above Mr. Seddon said: "I wish now to test whether there is really to be, on the part of the South, the privilege of participation in its enjoyment. What benefit to us that States are to be admitted from this territory, with or without slavery, as the people forming State constitutions may prefer, if in the intermediate time the slaveholder with his property is to be excluded by the pretext of Mexican law, or by the territorial legislation of the insignificant communities now occupying it? By the vote of the committee on my amendment, we can determine whether this alledged intervention be a substance—a reality, or a mere shadow of a name—a pretence and a cover for our exclusion, under the supposed operation of Mexican laws, or by hostile squatter legislation. Let us see whether our rights, as southerners and slaveholders, to participation in our common territories will be acknowledged and secured, even as to this pitiful waste of desert land."

The proposition of Mr. Seddon, was voted down—Ayes 55—Nays 85.

Mr. Millson, of Virginia, offered the following to be appended to the 1st section of the Utah bill:

"*Provided*, That no law or usage existing in the said Territory, at or before the time when the same was acquired by the United States, shall be held to destroy or impair, within the said Territory, any rights of property or relations of persons that may be now recognized and allowed in any of the United States."

Mr. Millson said after reading the above: "Sir, the sole object of the amendment I have offered, is simply to provide that no court shall give such effect to the past legislation of Mexico, as to hold that *it* interferes with the rights of southern citizens. The amendment does not seek to *establish* slavery. It does not propose to forestall either congressional or territorial legislation. It does not protect the rights of property or the relations of persons against anything but Mexican legislation. What excuse can there be for refusing to insert such a provision in the bill, except that it is really expected and intended that the bill as it now stands shall secure our exclusion from this territory?"

The proposition was voted down—Ayes 49, Nays 92.

Mr. Seddon offered the following, as an additional proviso to the 1st Section of the Utah bill:

"And that prior to the formation of a State constitution, there shall be no prohibition by the action of the territorial legislature of the emigration of any citizen of the United States, with any property recognised as such by the laws of any of the States of the Union."

Mr. Welborn, of Ga., moved to amend the amendment as follows:

Provided further, That the people of said Territory be allowed to pass all laws necessary for the protection of slavery within said territory, should slaves be introduced there.

Mr. Seddon, moved to amend the amendment by adding the following:

"And to remove all restrictions to the free emigration of persons with their property."

Mr. Hubbard said, before these amendments were put, that, "Respecting the extent of injury inflicted upon the southern people by these measures, after all that has happened, both having voted for paying Texas ten millions, puts me in mind of the verdicts of a jury once trying two men for fighting. It was in proof that each had been badly beaten and gouged. They severed in their trials. The jury returned a verdict of *not guilty* as to the first. It was agreed that the same jury might try the second also, when every one expected he, at least, would be severely fined and punished; but to the astonishment of all at court, the same jury, upon the same proof, found the second man not guilty also. Consequently, there had been no fight or wrong, although both were nearly beaten to death. So it seems is the fact in this case; there has been no wrong done to the South, although we have been nearly ten months trying the matter, and notwithstanding, also, the South has been deprived of all her interest in the newly acquired Mexican territory, for which she paid her full share, and has been taxed her part of the ten millions to pay Texas; and yet, according to the argument of gentlemen, "little or no harm has been done!" Nobody is guilty!"

All the above propositions were negatived. The vote not given.

Mr. Davis of Miss., offered the following amendment—the record reads thus:

"To strike out in the sixth line of the tenth section the words "in respect to African slavery," and insert the words "with those rights of property growing out of the institution of African slavery as exists in any of the States of this Union." The object of the amendment is to prevent the territorial legislature from legislating against the rights of property growing out of the institution of slavery."

Mr. Clay said in relation to the clause that this amendment proposed to strike out, that it was "introduced into the bill by the committee, for the purpose of tying up the hands of the territorial legislature, in respect to legislating at all, one way or the other, upon the subject of African slavery." "I repeat what I have before said, that I cannot vote to convert a territory already free into a slave territory. I am satisfied, for one, to let the *lex loci*, as it exists, remain." He continued thus:

"According to my opinion, the laws of Mexico still prevail in that country, because Texas never had possession of that country, never legislated for that country, and her laws never stretched over that country; but, on the contrary, the country remained in the possession of Mexico until, by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, it was ceded to the United States. In my opinion, therefore, the local law which prevails in New Mexico—as well in New Mexico east of the Rio Grande as west of it—is the law of Mexico, as pronounced by the Dictator of Mexico, by the constitutional authority of Mexico, and by the legislative power of Mexico. That is my own opinion.

"Again: "If the Supreme Court shall be of opinion either that the laws of Texas stretch over New Mexico this side of the Rio Grande, or, as maintained by my friend from Georgia, that the Constitution of the United States abolished the Mexican laws by which slavery was abrogated, in either case the owner of slaves in New Mexico would have a right to enjoy the possession of his property. *But if, on the contrary, as I believe, the Constitution did no such thing*, and Texas, not having actual possession, did not extend her laws there, *then it would follow that the right to maintain and carry slaves there would not prevail.*"

Again, in reply to a remark of Senator Rusk, of Texas, Mr. Clay, said:

"I spoke of the law as it exists *de facto* or *de jure*. But law cannot be introduced without some action by legislative authority, if there be a pre-existing local law. If there be a law *de facto*, although the title may be in Texas, yet the *lex loci* will exist until the law assuming that Texas has a good title is carried through by the force of legislative authority."

Jefferson Davis, said in reply to Mr. Clay, that, "The object of the amendment is to restrict the territorial legislature from action hostile to property, but not from making necessary provisions for its protection: so that, instead of saying that "no law shall be passed in respect to African slavery," it should declare that "no law shall be passed interfering with those rights of property which grow out of the institution of African slavery, as it exists in any of the States of this Union." As I stated, laws in respect to African slavery are necessary wherever such slaves are held. The Senator from Kentucky knows that as well as any one can; he knows that there are police regulations which must be enacted where that species of property is held."

Again: "I make this amendment to the bill for establishing a government for New Mexico, to show to those whom I represent what are the terms of the law, if it shall become one; how it is construed by its framers; and how it rolls with immolating wheel over the rights of my constituents."

Mr. Clay in the same debate, after being driven from position to position, finally says: "I must say that I cannot vote for any express provision *recognizing* the *right* to carry slaves there."

Senator Davis modified the amendment so as to read thus:

"That nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to prevent said territorial legislature from passing such laws as may be necessary for the protection of the rights of property of every kind, which may have been, or may be hereafter, conformably to the Constitution and laws of the United States, held in, or introduced into said territory."

This proposition, was ably debated, and we think it drew out the best talent in the Senate. Jeff. Davis, our own Senator, met Mr. Clay in debate, and we hazard nothing in saying that he more than sustained himself—he forced the great Kentuckian to abandon position after position.

But all was without avail—the proposition was voted down. Yeas 25—Noes 30.

Chase proposed as an amendment to the above, the Wilmot Proviso, and it was voted down—Yeas 25—Noes 30.

Mr. Yulee of Florida, offered the following:

"*And be it further enacted*, That the Constitution and laws of the United States are hereby extended over, and declared to be in force in the said territory of Utah, so far as the same or any provision thereof may be applicable."

Mr. Foote said of this amendment, that it was "entirely useless," &c.

It passed, however, and will be found as the last section to the Utah bill, and the 17th to the New Mexico bill.

Mr. Webster said on the 7th of March: "Sir, I declared my opinion to be, that there is not a square rod of territory belonging to the United States, the character of which, for slavery or no slavery, is not already fixed by some irrepealable law. I remain of that opinion. The opinion, sir, has been a good deal canvassed in the country, and there have been complaints—sometimes respectful and decorous, and sometimes so loud and so empty as to become mere clamor. But I have seen no argument upon any question of law embraced in that opinion, which shakes the firmness with which I hold it, nor have I heard any discussion upon any matter of fact, as to that part of the opinion which rests on facts, which leads me to doubt the accuracy of my conclusions as to that part of the opinion which regarded the true construction, or I might with more propriety say, almost the literal meaning, of the resolutions by which Texas was admitted into the Union. I have heard no argument calculated, in the slightest degree, to alter that opinion. The committee, I believe, with one accord, concurred in it. A great deal of surprise, real or affected, has been expressed in the country at the announcement by me of that opinion, as if there were something new in it. Yet there need have been no surprise, for there was nothing new in it. Other gentlemen have expressed the same opinion more than once; and I myself, in a speech made here on the 23rd day of March, 1848, expressed the same opinion, almost in the same words; with which nobody here found any fault—at which nobody here cavilled or made question, and nobody in the country.

"With respect to the other ground on which my opinion is founded, that is, the high improbability, in point of fact, that African slavery could be introduced and established in any of the territories acquired by us in pursuance of the late treaty with Mexico, I have learned nothing, heard nothing, from that day to this, that has not entirely confirmed that opinion. That being my judgment on this matter, I voted very readily and cheerfully to exclude what is called the Wilmot proviso from these territorial bills, or to keep it out, rather, when a motion was made to introduce it. I did so, upon a very full and deep conviction that no act of Congress, no provision of law, was necessary in any degree for that purpose. That was my judgment, and I acted on it; and it is my judgment still. Those who think differently, will, of course, pursue a different line of conduct, in accordance with their own judgments. That was my opinion then, and it has been strengthened by every thing that I have learned since, and I have no more apprehension to-day of the introduction or establishment of African slavery in these territories, than I have of its introduction into, and establishment in, Massachusetts."

As to the necessity of some specific law to protect slavery in the territories, we will introduce Senator Foote, as a witness, and show that he goes the whole doctrine—is ultra. And surely, Mr. Cobb and his party ought to be willing to take Gen. Foote, as their leader and guide—he is the head and front of the submission party, and his doctrine, ought to be the law with his followers. But Foote says: "Again, he contended that slavery could not exist without legislative protection. If a man should take a hundred slaves into one of these foreign Territories, and they should rebel against him, what law is there to which he can appeal. And suppose a man comes to steal his slaves, to carry them to the Pacific, and the owner threatens to appeal to the law; he will be answered, you can do nothing—there is no law in the case. There are many in his section of country disposed to emigrate to California; but there was not one who would be such a dolt as to carry a slave there, because he could not hold him, in consequence of the hands of the local authorities being tied up, so that they could not interfere on the subject of slavery."

Stop the Slander.

We do hope that the Union party and federalists of this county, since they have heard the old hero, will cease their efforts to prejudice his claims before the people, by the charge of disunion.

Hear what he said in the presence of one of the largest assemblages of the voters of Lowndes, that we ever saw. His declaration was, "That he had periled his life for the Union more than once, upon the bloody battle-field—that he would do so again, if it became necessary."

Again he said, "That there was no man, in all the Union ranks, that would sacrifice more than he would, to preserve the Constitution and Union of these States."

Again he declared, "That all his efforts as Governor of this State, had been directed to the protection of southern institutions—the interests of our own citizens, and the preservation of the Union of our Revolutionary fathers. That he choose the path of duty rather than the one pointed out by ambition. That the one was difficult and rugged, the other easy and smooth. His own and the fate of his children were bound up in the destiny of Mississippi."

And finally he said "That disunion was no where to be found in his Message. The true construction of that document stopped far short of secession. It contained but one recommendation, and that was the call of the State Convention, through which the people might express their sovereign will. When that will was thus expressed, he would cheerfully obey and carry it out. That he was nominated by and was the representative of, the Democratic State Rights party, and of course, stood upon the platform put forth by that party on the occasion of his nomination."

He here read the 15th. resolution which took positive position against secession, and showed that the words "prompt and peaceable secession" that occurred in his Message, were not for the past, but as that document expressed it, for evils that must continue to grow from year to year. And who does not agree with him that the north will force us to disunion, if they continue to aggress upon our rights, and continue to insult and defraud us by unconstitutional legislation against our peculiar institution by which they will bring about its ultimate destruction.

HOME, Noxubee County, Miss., July 26, 1851.

Editor Southern Standard:

DEAR SIR:—I send you an outline of A. W. Dabney Esqr's speech, delivered at Brooksville, in this county, on the 12th. instant. I think it entitled to a place in your curiosity shop. It should be left on record as a monument to Mr. D.'s genius, at least.—But you will decide as to the propriety of its publication.

Mr. Dabney, like all of the Federal Union orators, to whom I have listened, commenced his speech by declaring that the object of the Republican or States Rights party was disunion, under the lead of John A. Quitman—denied the right of secession, and yet claimed to be a States Rights man. Asserted that there was nothing unconstitutional in the so-called compromise measures.

He next stated that the real issues were indicated by the proceedings of the extra session of the Mississippi legislature, and Gov. Quitman's Message. To prove that disunion was the object of that legislature, he read editorials from the Mississippian, Jacksonian, Woodville Republican and other newspapers! Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, was now introduced, and properly abused, and to close the evidence on this head, something was said about the rejection by the Legislature of Mr. Steuart's resolution, and the 15th. resolution of the State Sights platform—denying that this latter was the true position of that party.

Here he introduced the Union platform, and declared that when violated by the powers at Washington, *the mode and measure of redress would be submitted to the people.* Asserted, if elected to the Convention, and Congress should abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, he would throw himself upon his natural rights and kick up particular thunder, of course. How ridiculous! And yet, if you can credit anything so absurd, there were men there who cheered!

Gov. Quitman was here introduced again, and some extracts read from his Message, and construed to suit the speaker, as a matter of course. The eminent men of South Carolina were declared to be against secession without any qualification. The Legislature of Mississippi again introduced—the refusal to hoist the United States flag during its sitting, incontestible proof of disunion motives.

Gen. Jackson's force bill declared to contain no federal doctrines. Then he commented upon the District of Columbia bill, (the first time the gentleman touched the questions at issue) and how do you suppose he made good his furious assertion that there was nothing unconstitutional in any of the compromise bills! He said that *Mr. Van Buren*, (Martin, the free-soiler) *stated, at some time, that Congress should assimilate her legislation in the District of Columbia, to that of the States of Virginia and Maryland!!*

Is not that rich!

Something was now said about discriminating between offences and rights; and slavery placed upon the same footing with imported goods. I regard this part of the gentleman's speech as a scuttle fish operation, to blind the eyes of the audience, to the mode of his escape from the District of Columbia bill and Mr. Van Buren.

Here he came to what he appeared to consider the important part of his speech, simply because it originated with his illustrious colleague, G. H. Foote, for he is not simple enough, I do not believe, to think that there was any force or truth in the position. But here he produced a map, and undertook to prove that the line of 36° 30', as voted for by the anti-compromise party in Congress, was more favorable to free-soil purposes than the Compromise bills, as they passed that body—that by it all of California, Utah and New Mexico would have been dedicated to free-soil!!—And he uttered that sentance with a serious countenance, and living men, with natural and well looking heads on, cheered! But when I think of the absurdity of the statement, and think of reasonable creatures, I am disposed to conclude that it was not a reality—that they were men in *buckram all.*

Who does not know that these very free-soilers voted down the very line of 36° 30'? If it suited their purposes better than the Compromise measures, would they not have voted for it, to a man? And did not their candidate for Governor, H. S. Foote, vote for the line of 35° 30'?

I did not hear Mr. Foote speak on this occasion, but presume it was the same old meddly. The position of this gentleman while speaking, frequently, and the peculiar straining, mournful tone which he gives to his voice—resembling those uttered by persons suffering from severe pains in the abdomen—made it very unpleasant for me to listen to him.

It is to be hoped that persons at a distance are sufficiently acquainted with the game of brag, which the federalists of this county have determined to play, not to be led astray by the "Macon *Beacon*" and the letter of G. H. Foote. The editor of the Beacon appeared, however, to entertain an exalted opinion of his position and ability, judging from an article headed "Tactics." He speaks of gentlemen in the "ordinary walks of life' with as much pomposity and arrogant presumption as if he were exalted above the ordinary tramels of mortality, and the forming and controlling public opinion, appears to be his peculiar office. Well, great men will sometimes expose their weak points.—Let the mantle of charity fall upon this little indulgence in egotism—for the writer, doubtless, felt wonderfully exalted at entering upon the editorship of such a sheet as the "Beacon." I believe that the big-head is not confined to horses alone, and it may be that the writer of "Tactics" had some swelling about the knowledge-box. But there is hope yet. *Dr. Davis* is expected in Noxubee again. He possesses great skill in reducing swellings in that organ.

NOXUBEE.

For the Standard.

WESTPOINT Miss. Aug. 19th 1851.

Gen. Griffin delivered an address before the States Right Association at Westpoint on Saturday last. He commenced and proceeded in a pleasant and happy manner. At the close of every sentence receiving cheers and applause from the entire house. He stated the question at issue between the two parties, and then proceeded to discuss them in an eloquent and Statesman-like manner, attracting the attention of the audience as though they were under the influence of mesmerism. He wiped away the scales from the eyes of every Sub, that was present, and proved to them that the States Right party is the one that every true Southron ought to belong. Every person present agreed that they never heard a subject more amply treated.

On motion of Moses Jordan the association adjourned. James Robertson, President.

HORSE-SHOE.

Analysis of Bailey's Springs—Lauderdale Co. Alabama—By M. Tuomey.

This noted Spring, like all the mineral springs of Lauderdale county, that I have yet seen, has its origin in the cherly rocks at the base of the carboniferous limestone.

I regret that I have it in my power only to make a *qualitative* analysis of this far famed water. That, however, was conducted with as much care as possible, yet it is proper to state that under more favorable circumstances, an analysis, in which a larger quantity of the water could be used, might develope other ingredients in addition to those given below.

Carbonate of Iron.
Carbonate of Soda.
Chloride of Sodium.
Carbonate of Potash (traces.)
Sulphur in combination, perhaps, with Soda.

The Iron is in greater abundance than would appear from the deposit below the outlet of the Spring. It is even thrown down slowly during the process of concentration by boiling. The prominent ingredients are Carbonic Acid, Iron and Soda.

Shameful Falsehood and Misrepresentation.

We notice in the Journal, of Wednesday morning last, an article headed "The Slave Trade in the District of Columbia," which article we see copied in several federal papers simultaneously, in which it is asserted that the act of Congress of the 27th. February, 1801, (which re-enacted the Maryland law, *abolishing* the slave trade in the District of Columbia, to correspond with a prior act of that State, passed in 1796,) "was approved by Thomas Jefferson, then president."

Now, we take it for granted, that the Journal knew when it penned the above, that Mr. Jefferson was not president, and therefore could not have approved the aforesaid act of 27th. of February, in 1801. We take it for granted that it *knew the fact* that Mr. Jefferson was not inaugurated president until the 4th. of March 1801, five days after the above act was approved.—We take in for granted that it knew the fact, that the aforesaid act of Congress approving and re-enacting the Maryland law, abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, was passed by the Federal Congress of 1801, and was approved by old John Adams, the father or one of the fathers of the federal party, as one of the last acts of defunct federalism. And we take it for granted further, that it knew the fact, that this federal law of the expiring administration of old John Adams was immediately repealed or essentially modified by the incoming Republican administration of Thomas Jefferson, at the very first session of the Republican Congress. Like the Alien and Sedition acts—it was swept from the statute book, and left as a monumental wreck of the usurpations of federalism, to be dressed up, done over, and revived by the same party, who had deceived the people and stole into power in 1851.

Presuming that the Journal and the State Register too, knew the above facts—for we could not suppose them ignorant of so ordinary a portion of the political history of the country—we ask the people what reliance can be placed in those assertions or statements of such papers? It is not necessary for us to characterize such barefaced deception and fraud; every honorable man will necessarily apply the proper denunciation.

Thus would these zealous advocates of federalism absolutely steal the name of our great apostle, Jefferson, in order to hide and cover up their odious and infamous acts from the indignation of the people. Let it be remembered then, that the first act of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia was passed by the Federal party, and approved by old John Adams, 27th February, 1801, that this act was repealed or essentially modified by the *Republican party* the 3rd of March, 1802, and that the old law of the Federal party and old John Adams was revived and re-enacted in a more odious form by the present administration.—*Advertiser and Gazette.*

☞Read what that blackhearted abolitionist of Kentucky says of slavery. But he utters the same language of other *southern* abolitionists—in fact we have heard expression given to opinions, which, if uttered in this community ten years ago, would have purchased for the utterer a suit of tar and feathers, well put on.

But this is a free country, and men may now be permitted to preach up doctrines tending to domestic sedition, and slaveholders endorse and countenance them. We shall reap the fruit of these doctrines too soon it is feared.

WHITEHALL, Madison Co, Ky. }
May 26, 1851. }

Gentlemen:—Your favor of last month is received. It would give me great pleasure to be present with you on the 4th of July next as proposed, did circumstances allow. But I am canvassing the State with a view of organizing an anti-slavery party in Kentucky. I think I can be more usefully, though far less agreeable employed here.

Allow me to say, however, that I regard this contest as embracing the liberty or slavery of all, white and black. Of course it cannot be an issue between the North and South, but between the slaveholding aristocracy of the South and the large shipping merchants and cotton dealers of the North, on the one hand, and the great non-slave holding masses of the whole Union on the other.

Our fathers of '76 knew well that liberty and slavery could not co-exist—there was declared a truce, but no permanent peace was made or anticipated. Jefferson embodied their sentiments in his letter to Ed. Cole, of Illinois, contended that they of '76 but began the vindication of our liberty by the revolutionary war—that it remained to us, the descendants of the patriots of that day, to complete our liberties by the overthrow of slavery.

Slavery, so far from being extinct as Mr. Madison and others believed, in consequence of which they would not leave the word "slave" on record in the constitution of of '88, has strengthened itself and carried on an aggressive war in the slave and free States.

In South Carolina the great mass of the laboring class are about to be precipitated into a revolution without being heard by the ballot in their own behalf! The liberty of Northern anti-slavery men in slave States is impossible. The United States Constitution is overthrown by the fugitive slave law! By that, persons *now free* in free States are returned into slavery which was inflicted on some remote ancestor—"*partus sequiter ventrem.*"

The slave party with a high hand tramples down all the principles and usages of such liberty even, as aristocracies and limited monarchies have for many centuries enjoyed. I said one year ago to the members of the New York Legislature that the American people were slaves! I was set down as a fanatic! How now?!!

No, we must arouse ourselves at once or we are lost. Such men as Webster and Dickinson in the north are traitors to freedom; they must be put down! In the South, the masters must learn that slave States are not made up only of masters and slaves—but that another class, the great white laboring masses, must begin to be estimated in political calculations.

The government every where must be put upon the free track! The cry must be once more, "liberty or death!" till, in the land of the free, men shall have equal rights!

Your friend, C. M. CLAY.

Messrs. Jeff. Mabury, and others, committee.

Alabama.

A Mobile paper speaking of the late election in that State, indicates the position of parties, and shows upon what issues the candidatks run in the different Congressional districts:

"From the returns received, and previous knowledge, it is pretty certain that the representation from this State, to the next Congress will be as follows;

1st. District—John Bragg.
2nd. " James Abercrombie.
3rd. " Sampson W. Harris.
4th. " William R. Smith.
5th. " Mr. Houston.
6th. " William R. W. Cobb.
7th. " Alexander White.

Of these gentlemen, Messrs. Harris and Cobb, were members of the last Congress. The others are new members.

According to former political distinction, the members elect are all Democrats, except Messrs. Abercrombie and White. The representatives from Alabama will therefore stand as it did in the last Congress, 5 to 2.

As to the leading political issue of the present day, it may be set down that Messrs. Bragg, Harris, and Hurbard, (3) are "Southern Rights" men, while Messrs. Abercrombie, Smith Cabb, and White (4) are "Union" men. But this division demands an explanation. None of the members elect are disunionists or advocates of Secession. The Southern Rights men only contend for the abstract right of Secession, as a supra-constitutional remedy, but do not urge its exercise for existing causes. In this they are not materially different from the "Union" Representatives who all claim to stand upon the Georgia Platform, and are pledged, in case of any further aggressions, to resist "even to a disruption of every tie which binds the State to the Union." They therefore *practically* differ from their Southern Rights colleagues, only as tweedledum did from tweedledee.

But this further explanation is also necessary to understand properly the political character of the memberr elect. In the first and second districts, the election turned mainly upon the question of the approval of the Compromise Measures. None of the candidates were advocates of Secession.—Messrs. Bragg and Harris were chosen because they were opponents of the Compromise, while Messrs. Langdon and Mudd, their antagonists, were its advocates and justifiers.

In the Second District, the Southern Rights candidate, Mr. Cochran, was understood to hold ultra Secession views, and was defeated for the reason. Had a more moderate and conservative Southern Rights man been run, it is probable he would have been elected. The same may be said as to the Seventh District, Mr. Rice was an advocate of the doctrines of the Montgomery Platform, indeed one of its chief framers,—and so extreme in his sentiments, as to frighten off hundreds of the warmest friends of Southern Rights in the strong Democratic District in which he ran, and, was